

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box, 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,874	10/15/2003	Hiroji Aga	109725.01	4805
25944	7590 12/13/2005		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928			ESTRADA, I	MICHELLE
	A, VA 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	•

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·			13
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/684,874	AGA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michelle Estrada	2823	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wil	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re on. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONI statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communicatio ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	19 September 2005.		
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for al			6
closed in accordance with the practice un	ider <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are pending in the appear 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and appears to the subject to the subject to restriction and appears to the subject to the subject to th	thdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exact 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the county The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand orrection is required if the drawing(s)	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(네).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in Aperically documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/19/05.	8) Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) - ·	

Application/Control Number: 10/684,874

Art Unit: 2823

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yamamoto (JP-10275905), Falster et al. (5,919,302) and Wolf et al. (Vol. 1).

With respect to claim 1, Yamamoto discloses a method for producing an SOI wafer by the hydrogen ion delamination method comprising at least a step of bonding a base wafer (5) and a bond wafer (1) having a micro bubble layer formed by gas ion implantation (See fig. 1C) and a step of delaminating a wafer having an SOI layer at the micro bubble as a border (See fig. 1E); and wherein the wafer having an SOI layer is subjected to a heat treatment under an atmosphere containing hydrogen in a batch processing type furnace after the delamination step (See Abstract).

Yamamoto does not disclose wherein a CZ wafer produced from a single crystal ingot of which COPs are reduced for the whole crystal is used as the bond wafer.

Wolf et al. (Vol. 1) discloses that the CZ wafer can be produced from a single crystal ingot (See pages 23-25).

It would have been within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Yamamoto and Wolf et al. to enable production of the CZ wafer to be performed in the process of Yamamoto because it has a relative high degree of crystal purity and it helps to simplify the process.

Falster et al. discloses a silicon single crystal ingot of which COPs or defects are reduced for the whole crystal (Col. 2, lines15-35).

It would have been within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Yamamoto, Falster et al. and Wolf et al. to enable the crystal ingot formation step of Yamamoto and Wolf et al. to be performed according to the teachings of Falster et al. because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look to alternative suitable methods of performing the disclosed crystal ingot formation step of Yamamoto and Wolf et al. and art recognized suitability for an intended purpose has been recognized to be motivation to combine. See MPEP 2144.07. Further, it will enhance quality of the product.

With respect to claim 3, it is inherent that the process of Yamamoto will result in an SOI wafer which has a RMS value of 0.5 nm or less concerning surface roughness for both 1 μ m square and 10 μ m square, because the same process is being performed in Yamamoto as that of the instant invention and it will yield the same result.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/684,874 Page 4

Art Unit: 2823

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Estrada whose telephone number is 571-272-

1858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-

2800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michelle Estrada Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2823

ME

December 5, 2005